

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Daniel S. King,

Plaintiff

v.

City of Henderson,

Defendant

Case No. 2:19-cv-01129-JAD-BNW

**Order Denying
Motion to Extend Time**

[ECF No. 12]

Plaintiff Daniel S. King moves¹ for a 60-day extension of his October 28, 2019, deadline to respond to the City of Henderson's motion to dismiss.² But King did not sign and file his extension request until the day after his response deadline ran.³ Local Rule IA 6-1 states that "A request made after the expiration of the specified period will not be granted unless the movant . . . demonstrates that the failure to file the motion before the deadline expired was the result of excusable neglect." King did not even acknowledge the untimeliness of his motion, let alone demonstrate excusable neglect. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **the motion to extend time [ECF No. 12] is DENIED.** King must file a response to the motion to dismiss, or a proper motion to extend the response deadline, by November 22, 2019, to avoid having the motion to dismiss granted as unopposed.

Dated: November 18, 2019



U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

¹ ECF No. 12.

² ECF No. 9.

³ Compare docket entry at ECF No. 9 (setting a response deadline of 10/28/19) with ECF No. 12 (reflecting a signing date of 10/29/19).